

Appl. No. : 10/635,423  
Filed : August 6, 2003

**REMARKS**

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the January 30, 2006 Office Action. Claims 1 and 13-15 are amended, and Claims 2-12 remain as originally filed. Thus, Claims 1-15 are presented for further consideration. Please enter the amendments and reconsider the claims in view of the following remarks.

**Comments on Personal Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for extending the courtesy of conducting a personal interview with Applicants' representatives, Mark J. Kertz, Esq. and Scott Evans on March 28, 2006. During the interview, Claims 13 and 14 were discussed as were U.S. Patent No. 6,599,317 issued to Weinschenk III *et al.* and the Hara *et al.*, *Ophthalmic Surgery* reference cited below. The amendments and remarks herein are in accordance with this discussion.

**Response to Rejection of Claims 13-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In the January 30, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,599,317 B1 issued to Weinschenk, III *et al.* ("Weinschenk").

**Claim 13**

Applicants have amended Claim 13 to recite:

13. An intraocular lens system comprising:
  - a posterior portion comprising a posterior optic adapted to move a first distance in a forward direction; and
  - an anterior portion comprising an anterior optic and first and second arms extending radially outward from the anterior optic, the anterior optic adapted to move a second distance in the forward direction in response to the first distance movement of the posterior optic wherein the posterior portion contacts the anterior portion inward of the outer radial extremity of the arms and urges the anterior optic forward, wherein the second distance is larger than the first distance.

Applicants submit that Weinschenk does not disclose all the limitations of amended Claim 13. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended Claim 13 is patentably distinguished over Weinschenk. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 13 and pass this claim to allowance.

**Claim 14**

Applicants have amended Claim 14 to recite:

Appl. No. : 10/635,423  
Filed : August 6, 2003

14. An intraocular lens system comprising:  
a posterior optic adapted to move a first distance in a forward direction;  
and  
an anterior optic adapted to move a second distance in the forward direction, wherein the second distance is larger than the first distance, wherein the posterior optic is the posterior-most optic of the lens system and the anterior optic is biased in the rearward direction by the lens system.

Applicants submit that Weinschenk does not disclose all the limitations of amended Claim 14. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended Claim 14 is patentably distinguished over Weinschenk. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 14 and pass this claim to allowance.

Claim 15

Applicants have amended Claim 15 to recite:

15. A method of facilitating accommodative motion in an intraocular lens system, said method comprising:

providing an intraocular lens system comprising a posterior optic adapted to move a first distance in a forward direction and an anterior optic adapted to move a second distance in the forward direction, wherein the second distance is larger than the first distance, wherein the posterior optic is the posterior-most optic of the lens system and the anterior optic is biased in the rearward direction by the lens system; and

translating forward movement of the posterior optic of the intraocular lens system into forward movement of the anterior optic of the intraocular lens system, thereby providing ocular accommodation.

Applicants submit that Weinschenk does not disclose all the limitations of amended Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended Claim 15 is patentably distinguished over Weinschenk. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 15 and pass this claim to allowance.

**Response to Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9, and 12-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

In the January 30, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-7, 9, and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hara et al. in *Ophthalmic Surgery*, February 1990, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 128-133 (“Hara”).

Claim 1

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite:

1. An intraocular lens system adapted to be implanted within an eye, the intraocular lens system comprising:  
an anterior optic movable in a forward direction within the eye;

Appl. No. : 10/635,423  
Filed : August 6, 2003

at least two anterior haptic arms extending radially outward from the anterior optic, each anterior haptic arm having a first end coupled to the anterior optic and a second end adapted to be coupled to the eye;

a posterior optic movable in the forward direction within the eye and coupled to the anterior haptic arms, wherein the posterior optic contacts the at least two anterior haptic arms inward of the second end of each anterior haptic arm towards the anterior optic; and

at least one posterior haptic member adapted to be coupled to the eye and coupled to the posterior optic, wherein the anterior haptic arms are responsive to a first forward movement of the posterior optic by actuating a second forward movement of the anterior optic, the second forward movement substantially larger than the first forward movement.

Applicants submit that Hara does not disclose all the limitations of amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Hara. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 and pass this claim to allowance.

Claims 2-7, 9, and 12

Each of Claims 2-7, 9, and 12 depends from amended Claim 1, so each of Claims 2-7, 9, and 12 includes all the limitations of amended Claim 1 as well as other limitations of particular utility. For at least the reasons stated above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claims 2-7, 9, and 12 are patentably distinguished over Hara. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 2-7, 9, and 12 and pass these claims to allowance.

Claims 13-15

Applicants submit that Hara does not disclose all the limitations of amended Claims 13-15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 13-15 and pass these claims to allowance.

**Response to Rejection of Claims 8, 10, and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the January 30, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 8, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara.

Each of Claims 8, 10, and 11 depends from amended Claim 1, so each of Claims 8, 10, and 11 includes all the limitations of amended Claim 1 as well as other limitations of particular utility. For at least the reasons stated above with regard to the patentability of amended Claim 1 over Hara, Applicants submit that Claims 8, 10, and 11 are patentably distinguished over Hara.

Appl. No. : 10/635,423  
Filed : August 6, 2003

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 8, 10, and 11 and pass these claims to allowance.


**Summary**

For the above-stated reasons, Applicants submit that Claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully requests such action.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/18/06

By: 

Bruce S. Itchkawitz  
Registration No. 47,677  
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP  
Attorney of Record  
2040 Main Street  
Fourteenth Floor  
Irvine, CA 92614  
(949) 760-0404

2441877  
041806